

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- [HUFNAGEL], 1767. Fortsetzung der Tabelle von den Nachtvögeln, welche die 3te Art derselben, nemlich die Spannenmesser (*Phalaenas Geometras Linnaei*) enthält. *Berlinisches Mag.*, vol. 4 (6), pp. 599–626.
- SPEIDEL, W. 1983. The Acentropinae (Lepidoptera Crambidae) from Spain and Portugal. *SHILAP Revta lepid.*, vol. 11, pp. 83–86.
- TREITSCHKE, F. 1829. *Die Schmetterlinge von Europa*, vol. 7. Leipzig, 252 pp.
- MOORE, F. 1884–1887. *The Lepidoptera of Ceylon*, vol. 3. London, 578 pp., pls 144–215.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *LASPEYRESIA*

HÜBNER, [1825]. Z.N.(S.)2421

(see vol. 41, pp. 110–113)

- (1) By R. W. Hodges (*Systematic Entomology Lab USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.*)

The following view of Dr Kuznetsov and Dr Kerzhner's case for the suppression of *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] is given for the Commission's consideration before a decision is taken:

1. *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] is a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817;
2. The oldest synonym of *Laspeyresia* Hübner [1825] is *Cydia* Hübner, [1825];
3. *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] is the valid replacement name for *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], based on priority. This argument was used and followed by Bradley, 1972 and others as indicated in paragraph 8 of Kuznetsov & Kerzhner's statement;
4. Other arguments have little relevance for the future. Either decision will cause some workers difficulty; however, the decision based on priority, the basic principle of the Code, provides for stability of nomenclature.

The following point, though not germane to my argument, should be significant to the Commission: four checklists (Bradley, 1972 in Kloet & Hincks, *Checklist of British Insects*, pt 2, Lepidoptera; Léraut, 1980, *Liste systématique et synonymique des Lépidoptères de France, Belgique et Corse*; Powell, 1983 in Hodges, *Checklist of Lepidoptera of America north of Mexico*; and Powell, in press, in Heppner, *Atlas of Neotropical Lepidoptera, Checklist, part 1*) that treat a significant part of the world's lepidopteran fauna use *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] as the valid name and cite *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] as a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817.

I strongly urge the Commission not to suppress *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817.

- (2) By William E. Miller (*University of Minnesota, St Paul, Minnesota 55108, U.S.A.*)

As an active tortricidologist, I should like to comment on the proposal by Kuznetsov & Kerzhner to conserve *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] by suppressing *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 and *Cydia* Hübner, [1825].

The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, as I understand it, requires that *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] be rejected in favour of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 because of priority and homonymy. The proposal argues that applying the Code would cause the loss of the name *Laspeyresia* for a genus of common and important moths. The proposal cites relative counts of usage of the several pertinent names in *Entomology Abstracts* between 1974 and 1978, showing that *Laspeyresia* was the dominant name in that period.

I believe that stable nomenclature is best served when the Code is overridden only for reasons of unusual merit. It seems to me that the issue before the Commission comes down to how compelling the case is for conserving *Laspeyresia*. The argument that current usage of *Laspeyresia* dominates is greatly weakened when the usage figures in the same source are updated to the present. Thus, in *Entomology Abstracts* between January 1979 and July 1984 I count 130 uses of *Cydia* to only 56 of *Laspeyresia*. This shows a reversal of the trend cited in the proposal and shows that usage of *Laspeyresia* is rapidly declining in favour of *Cydia*.

In conclusion, I see little reason why the Commission should exercise its plenary powers as requested by the proposers.

(3) By J. D. Bradley (formerly of the British Museum (Natural History) and of the Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London), W. G. Tremewan, K. Tuck (British Museum (Natural History), London) and C. J. Hamilton (Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London)

With reference to the proposal to suppress *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] in favour of *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], we offer the following comments for consideration by the Commission:

- (1) *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] (TORTRICIDAE) is a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 (NOCTUIDAE) as stated by Nye, 1975, *Generic Names of Moths of the World*, vol. 1, p. 269;
- (2) The first available replacement name for *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] is *Cydia* Hübner, [1825];
- (3) *Cydia* Hübner, [1825], with *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] as a synonym, was used in 1972 in the revised Kloet & Hincks *Checklist of British Insects* part 2, Lepidoptera. The synonymy has since been absorbed without dissent in the world taxonomic and applied (economic) entomological literature. *Cydia* is accepted as the valid name in current western European, North American, Japanese and Indo-Australian faunal lists and other publications, as shown in the attached tabulation based on a computer search at the library of the Commonwealth Institute of Entomology by one of us (C.J.H.);
- (4) The use of *Cydia* in place of *Laspeyresia* is now well established and appears to have caused negligible disruption.

We urge the Commission not to suppress *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 but to uphold the Principle of Homonymy and thus maintain present stability.

CYDIA versus LASPEYRESIA

Bibliometric data obtained by an online search of the agricultural entomology subfile of the CAB Abstracts computer database, covering the world literature abstracted from January 1973 to April 1984 inclusive.